

**Before the
Federal Communications Commission
Washington, D.C. 20554**

| | | |
|---|---|---------------------|
| In the Matter of |) | |
| |) | |
| Application of SBC Communications, Inc., |) | |
| Pursuant to Section 271 of the |) | WC Docket No. 03-10 |
| Telecommunications Act of 1996 to Provide |) | |
| In-Region, InterLATA Services in Nevada |) | |

COMMENTS OF THE ALLIANCE FOR PUBLIC TECHNOLOGY

The Alliance for Public Technology has consistently urged the Federal Communications Commission (FCC) to pursue the goal of Section 706 of the Telecommunications Act of 1996¹ in every relevant proceeding by encouraging the reasonable and timely deployment of advanced telecommunications capability to all Americans.² Section 706 authorizes the FCC and state telecommunications commissions to use "measures that promote competition in the local telecommunications market or other regulating methods to remove barriers to infrastructure investment," among other means, to achieve the goal of ubiquitous broadband deployment mandated by the Act.

The Alliance for Public Technology (APT) is a nonprofit organization of public interest groups and individuals. APT's members work together to foster broad access to affordable, usable information and communications services and technology for the purpose of bringing better and more affordable health care to all citizens, expanding educational opportunities for

¹ 47 USC 157 note.

² See, e.g., Petition of the Alliance for Public Technology Requesting Issuance of Notice of Inquiry and Notice of Proposed Rulemaking to Implement section 706 of the 1996 Telecommunications Act, CC Docket No. 9244 (Feb. 18, 1998) (APT Petition) at 12-13.

lifelong learning, enabling people with disabilities to function in ways they otherwise could not, creating opportunities for jobs and economic advancement, making government more responsive to all citizens and simplifying access to communications technology. To this end, it is APT's goal to:

make available as far as possible, to all people of the United States, regardless of race, color, national origin, income, residence in rural or urban area, or disability high capacity two-way communications networks capable of enabling users to originate and receive affordable and accessible high quality voice, data, graphics, video and other types of telecommunications services.³

The Alliance is not in a position to judge the compliance of any one company with respect to the 14-point checklist of requirements under Section 271, and thus relies upon the expertise of state regulators. We note that the Nevada Public Utilities Commission, after an exhaustive review, unanimously approved SBC's application and concluded that SBC is in compliance with the checklist items in Section 271, stating "Many of Nevada's citizens already enjoy the benefits of competition in both the local and long distance markets."⁴ The PUC has approved 99 interconnection agreements and CLEC's are able to offer competitive services to 74% of SBC's access lines in Nevada. Further, SBC's self executing performance assurance plan protects against backsliding by putting up to 36% of net revenues (\$2.8 million) at risk annually for noncompliance.⁵

More importantly, SBC has demonstrated a commitment to increased investment in advanced telecommunications. According to SBC, in 2001 the company invested more than \$55

³ Alliance For Public Technology, *Principles to Implement the Goal of Advanced Service* at 3 (1995).

⁴ Recommendation in Support of Nevada Bell Telephone Company's Application to the Federal Communications Commission for Provision of In-Region InterLata Services in Nevada, PUC Docket No. 00-7031 at 27.

million to upgrade its infrastructure throughout Nevada.⁶ Authorization to provide in-region long distance service in Nevada will facilitate SBC capacity to build on economies of scale and scope in order to provide a high standard of service and accelerated deployment of advanced technologies to the consumers of Nevada.

In APT's view, interLATA prohibitions constrain the widespread deployment of advanced telecommunications infrastructure and therefore undermine Section 706, which seeks to promote investment in ubiquitous high-speed networks. APT maintains the belief that expeditious approval under Section 271 serves the public interest. Such action would advance the goals of Section 706, and reaffirm the Commission's commitment to eliminating regulatory barriers to investment in high-capacity networks.⁷

The Commission again has the opportunity to bolster Section 706's impact by authorizing SBC to provide long distance telephone service in Nevada. APT strongly urges the Commission to seize this opportunity to increase facilities-based competition for local and long distance service, and promote ubiquitous broadband network deployment so that all Nevada residents, regardless of their income level, location of residence, or physical disabilities, may improve the quality of their lives through access to new sophisticated telecommunications.

APT has every reason to believe that Nevada customers, particularly low volume users, will reap the same gains from lower prices and bundled services that Arkansas, California, Missouri, Kansas Oklahoma, and Texas residents are experiencing with SBC's entry into those

⁵ Recommendation in Support of Nevada Bell Telephone Company's Application to the Federal Communications Commission for Provision of In-Region InterLata Services in Nevada, PUC Docket No. 00-7031 at 210.

⁶ SBC Press Release, SBC Nevada Bell Contributes More Than \$210 to Nevada Economy During 2001 (January 9, 2002)

⁷ Comments of the Alliance for Public Technology Supporting Bell Atlantic's Request for Authority to Provide Long Distance Service in New York, In the Matter of Application by New York Telephone Company (d/b/a Bell Atlantic-New York) Bell Atlantic Communications, Inc., NYNEX Long Distance Company and Bell Atlantic Global

long distance markets. In anticipation of and in response to SBC's entry into the Texas, Kansas, and Oklahoma long-distance markets, incumbent long-distance carriers AT&T, WorldCom, and Sprint began to offer discounts on their regular long-distance plans to customers who also signed up for local service. These discounts are in the form of bundled long-distance monthly fees with local service charges and credits for signing up for a local/long-distance bundle.⁸ AT&T also offered "thank you" messages and thirty minutes of free long distance service to its customers in Kansas and Oklahoma in an effort to keep them from switching to new services.⁹ These actions demonstrate tangible benefits for consumers because of an increased number of competitors in the long distance market.

As SBC deploys its broadband networks, APT encourages the Commission to do all that it can to remove the barriers that inhibit the widest possible extension of these networks. Universal deployment will help all consumers, in Nevada and throughout the United States, to enjoy the benefits of advanced telecommunications capability.

APT respectfully recommends that the Commission authorize SBC to provide long distance service in Nevada.

Networks, Inc., for Authorization to Provide In-Region , InterLATA Services in New York, CC Docket No. 99-295 (Oct. 19, 1999))(APT NY Comments) at 2.

⁸ AT&T bundles residential local and long-distance service with a plan called "AT&T Local One Rate Texas." See <http://www.att.com/local_service/tx/html/index.html> (visited Oct. 9, 2000); see also J.G. Smith/Johnson Joint Aff. ¶ 43 (AT&T offers this local one rate only in Texas and New York, the two "states in which the incumbent Bell Operating Company has been given access to AT&T's long distance marketplace"). New York was the first state, followed by Texas, where MCI WorldCom started offering its bundled local and long-distance service referred to as "One Company Advantage." See David DeKok, Competitor Calls on Verizon's Mid-State Clients, Harrisburg Patriot-News, Sept. 14, 2000; Bill Sulon, Telephone Companies Prepare for Battle, Harrisburg Patriot-News, Aug. 27, 2000; see J.G. Smith/Johnson Joint Aff. ¶ 46. And Sprint currently bundles residential local and long-distance service for Texans in five different configurations. See Sprint Local Service – Texas, available at <<https://clec.sprint.com/servlet?CLEC?PAGE+TOCOMPARE&MKT=0003?>> (visited Oct. 9, 2000); see J.G. Smith/Johnson Joint Aff. ¶ 45.

⁹ AT&T Press Releases "AT&T Long Distance Customers in Oklahoma Get the Message: Thanks for Your Loyalty" and "AT&T Long Distance Customers in Kansas Get the Message: Thanks for

Respectfully requested,

Matthew D. Bennett
Policy Director
Alliance For Public Technology
919 18th Street, NW, Suite 900
Washington, D.C.

February 4, 2003

Your Loyalty” March 5, 2001. <http://www.att.com/press/item/0,1354,3702,00.html> and
<http://www.att.com/press/item/0,1354,3701,00.html>